

Peters	Sinema	Warnock
Reed	Smith	Warren
Rosen	Stabenow	Whitehouse
Sanders	Tester	Wyden
Schumer	Van Hollen	
Shaheen	Warner	

NAYS—47

Barrasso	Grassley	Risch
Blackburn	Hagerty	Romney
Blunt	Hawley	Rounds
Boozman	Hoeben	Rubio
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Burr	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Capito	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Shelby
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Cramer	Lummis	Tillis
Crapo	Marshall	Toomey
Cruz	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Paul	Young
Fischer	Portman	

NOT VOTING—1

Schatz

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SMITH). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The Senator from South Dakota.

FILIBUSTER

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, the Democrats' campaign to break the Senate continues.

I want to read a quote:

The ideologues in the Senate want to turn what the Founding Fathers called the cooling saucer of democracy into the rubber stamp of dictatorship.

Not my words—those are the words of the current Senate Democrat leader back in 2005 when filibuster changes were under discussion. The current Democrat leader was once, in fact, a defender of the filibuster and the role it plays in ensuring that the minority party in the Senate and the Americans it represents have a voice. In fact, the minority leader at various times has described trying to get rid of the filibuster as “doomsday for democracy.” He described those who were behind the effort to try to get rid of the filibuster as being in support of turning America into “a banana republic.” Those were statements made by the current Democrat leader when he was defending the filibuster in years past.

In fact, a lot of my colleagues across the aisle have defended the filibuster and used the filibuster repeatedly when they were in the minority. In the last Congress alone, Democrats filibustered COVID relief legislation until they got a bill that they could support. They filibustered police reform legislation. They filibustered Israel legislation. They filibustered pro-life legislation—and on and on.

While Republicans certainly didn't enjoy it when Democrats used the filibuster when we were in the majority, we recognized that it meant that our Senate was working the way that the Founders intended—as a place of compromise and deliberation, where the minority, as well as the majority, was represented. That is why we resisted

repeated calls from the former President, our party's President, when we had the majority to abolish the filibuster.

Abolishing the filibuster certainly would have made it easier for us to advance important legislation—legislation that was of value to Members on our side, things that we wanted to see get done—but we knew that sacrificing the long-term good of the Senate and the country for short-term gain was not an acceptable course of action.

Let's be very clear that the gain would have been short term. If we had abolished the legislative filibuster, we could have passed a lot of important legislation, only to see it overturned as soon as Democrats took control of the legislative and executive branches. Once we returned to unified Republican government, we could, of course, have put our original legislation back in place. That is the kind ping-ponging that would be terrible for our country.

Sharp changes in Federal policy every few years would mean endless confusion for Americans. Plus, free of the moderating influence of the filibuster, legislation would almost unquestionably become more extreme, which would harden and intensify partisan division not just here in Congress but in the country as a whole. Ordinary citizens would look ever more distrustful at government, which would quickly come to be seen as government for Americans of one party only—the party of power.

Democrats should know all of the things that I am saying. After all, they were in the minority just 1 year ago. It is hard for me to understand how they could forget that. Do they think that because they have the majority now, that they will always have it? History would beg to differ.

I realize the Democrats have hopes that if they pass their election legislation, it will help them stay in power, but surely—surely—Democrats don't believe that they can maintain a permanent hold on government. There have been some pretty robust Senate majorities in American history, but sooner or later, power has always shifted, and the Presidency has shifted too.

Even if Democrats succeed in all of their election machinations, the day will come—and probably sooner rather than later—when their party will return to the minority, and I suspect that at that point, they would bitterly regret the loss of the legislative filibuster.

Democrats have already had cause to regret the loss of the filibuster for judicial nominations. More than one Democrat Senator has openly admitted regretting Democrats' move to abolish the filibuster for judges and other nominees.

The unravelling of the filibuster for judicial nominations should be a lesson to both parties on how well weakening the filibuster or creating a filibuster carve-out would work. Democrats carved out a filibuster exception for ex-

ecutive and judicial nominees, and Republicans took it to its logical conclusion.

A legislative filibuster carve-out would be the end of the legislative filibuster, period.

If Democrats' carve out an exception for election legislation, a future Senate would be likely to carve out an exception for something else and so on and so forth, until the filibuster was carved out of existence completely.

In fact, I strongly suspect that a filibuster carve-out solely for election legislation wouldn't even survive the coming year. I can imagine my Democrat colleagues quickly deciding that some other priority of theirs was also worthy of a special exemption. It is possible that the legislative filibuster would be gone before the end of this Congress.

Again, I urge my Democrat colleagues to remember their decision to remove the filibuster for judicial nominations and how quickly that came back to haunt them. They may like the idea of forcing through their legislation now, but sooner or later—and probably sooner—I can guarantee that they will regret it.

The filibuster and its protection for the rights of the minority are safe so long as neither party starts to chip away at it. Once one party starts weakening the filibuster, especially on a totally partisan basis, that will be the end of the filibuster and the end of real representation for the minority in Congress.

It is deeply disappointing that the Democrat leader and the President have abandoned their previous support for protecting representation for the minority. It is even more astonishing, really, that they have done so when they enjoy the narrowest majorities in Congress. It should be a reminder of how quickly Democrats could once again return to the minority and be in need of the legislative filibuster.

But I know that there are Democrats out there with serious doubts about their leadership's course of action. Some would express this doubt openly, but I suspect there are others who haven't spoken up who also have serious reservations. After all, a majority of the current Senate Democrat caucus signed a letter just 4 short years ago expressing their belief in the importance of the filibuster. I cannot believe that all of them would change their position merely because the political winds have shifted.

So I urge all of my Democrat colleagues to resist this blatant power grab by the Democrat leadership and preserve our longstanding commitment to representation for the minority in the U.S. Senate, the purpose for which this institution was created, and the Americans it represents.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

COMMENDING THE ACTIONS OF CUBAN HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEMOCRACY ACTIVIST JOSE DANIEL FERRER GARCIA, AND ALL PRO-DEMOCRACY AND HUMAN RIGHTS ACTIVISTS, IN DEMANDING FUNDAMENTAL CIVIL LIBERTIES IN CUBA AND SPEAKING OUT AGAINST CUBA'S BRUTAL, TOTALITARIAN COMMUNIST REGIME

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, yesterday marked 6 months since July 11—a day when brave Cubans all across that island marched for democracy, cried out for freedom, and sent a clear message that the time was up for the illegitimate communist regime.

From Havana to Santa Clara to Santiago de Cuba, the message of "Patria y Vida!" could be heard from the people. Cuban families and demonstrators stood against the revolution's motto of "Patria o Muerte" to once again declare that the revolution had failed.

That failed revolution promised prosperity and equality for all, but the only equal thing about it was poverty, suffering, and oppression for all. We watched as families gathered outside the headquarters of the Cuban Communist Party to chant "Cuba isn't yours!" Their message was clear: It is time for a new day of freedom and democracy in Cuba.

Instead of listening to the cries of their people, the communist Cuban regime lashed out with violence and the oppression it has used for more than 60 years to silence opposition to its reign. The regime and its thugs kidnapped innocent democracy activists and kept others trapped in their homes. Right now, hundreds of Cubans have been indefinitely detained or unjustly sentenced to prison simply for demanding basic human rights.

Some of these protesters are facing prison sentences as long as 30 years. One of them is Jose Daniel Ferrer, the leader of the pro-democracy UNPACU group and a dedicated freedom and human rights activist. Since his detainment, I have had the chance to talk to his family several times. Each time we speak, the stories they tell me are more heartbreaking.

Jose Daniel is being tortured by the communist regime in an attempt to end his life. He is suffering from severe headaches, mouth bleeding, malnutrition, cough, and insomnia—all products of the cruel torture and inhumane treatment from the regime.

We can also think about Felix Navarro, another longtime freedom activist who helps lead a pro-democracy group on the island. He was arrested, not for demonstrating but for asking police about the status of some of the members of his group who had been detained.

Reports indicate even young teenagers are being detained indefinitely.

The unjust imprisonment, beatings, and torture of the Cuban people is abhorrent. It is inhumane, and it cannot

be tolerated. It is clear that these actions stem from the regime's paralyzing fear over the freedom movement spreading across Cuba. They are terrified that there is a new day of freedom on the rise for the Cuban people, so they resort to total oppression and to the silencing of any mention of independence or freedom.

As the greatest beacon of freedom and democracy in the world, the United States must stand against the communist regime and with the Cuban people. I am thankful that U.S. Assistant Secretary of State Brian Nichols recently called for the immediate release of the July 11 demonstrators. Along with his calls, we need the voices of President Biden and Secretary Blinken, and their calls need to be coupled with action that actually pressures the illegitimate communist Cuban regime now.

It was only a couple of weeks ago when I called the White House to talk about the case of Jose Daniel Ferrer. The first time I called, they asked me to leave a message, so I did. When I called the next day, the White House hung up on me.

Throughout his entire first year in office, Joe Biden has been shamefully silent about Cuba. Just like he does with communist China, Biden's strategy on Cuba is to do the bare minimum. Even while the protests were ongoing, he did nothing to alleviate the suffering of the Cuban people.

Compare that to the Organization of American States. After I spoke with them a few weeks ago, Secretary General Luis Almagro issued a statement demanding the immediate release of all arbitrarily imprisoned political prisoners. He expressed special concern for the well-being of Jose Daniel Ferrer and urged the Cuban regime to allow a humanitarian mission that can immediately verify the state and situation of political prisoners in the country.

Why can't Joe Biden make that same request? Where is the President? He has had 6 months to help provide internet to the Cuban people to help disseminate information and help the freedom movement, but he has done nothing. His silence is appeasement, and those of us who love freedom will not simply sit by idly while he refuses to act.

As long as the illegitimate communist Cuban regime continues to deny the people their freedom, democracy, and basic human rights, I am going to fight alongside them and demand action.

Today, the Senate can do something. Today, the U.S. Senate can pass a resolution honoring Cuban activists like Jose Daniel Ferrer, condemning the Cuban dictatorship's repression, and calling for the international community to stand with the Cuban people. I have introduced a resolution that does exactly that, and it is something that everyone in the Chamber should agree with.

I am thankful for Senators MARCO RUBIO and MIKE BRAUN for cospon-

soring this resolution. I am also thankful for MARIO DIAZ-BALART, Congresswoman SALAZAR, and Congressman GIMENEZ for introducing the companion resolution in the House.

We must make sure our message to the Cuban people is clear: America has not and will not forget you. We have seen your bravery and courage. We have heard your calls for freedom. You have risked everything for the freedom of Cubans across the island. You are an inspiration to us all.

I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate in Spanish.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(English translation of the statements made in Spanish are as follows:)

We must make sure our message to the Cuban people is clear: America has not and will not forget you.

We have seen your bravery and courage. We have heard your calls for freedom.

You have risked everything for the freedom of Cubans across the island. You are an inspiration to us all.

Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 489, which is at the desk. I further ask that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me first say that I rise, in the first instance, before having heard the Senator's remarks, to say that I have serious concerns about the junior Senator from Florida's lack of respect for the regular order of the Senate.

On July 11, 2021, the Cuban people took to the streets in unprecedented protests, demanding democracy and the end of decades of dictatorship. Subsequently, the Senate came together in unanimous consent to pass my S. Res. 310. My bipartisan legislation expressed our unwavering solidarity with the Cuban people and called for the release of all political prisoners detained unjustly by the Diaz-Canel regime.

My legislation was the result of bipartisan negotiations, and it was approved unanimously by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. That is what regular order looks like, and it is a process that strengthens the impact of our work on foreign policy when we can speak together in one voice to promote that foreign policy, whether it is to the Cuban regime or whether it is in any other place in the world.

Now, I need to make the point that the junior Senator from Florida routinely disregards this process. In this particular case, not only has this resolution not been marked up by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, not only is it not bipartisan—as far as I know, nobody has been offered even the